

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program

Implementation Step 2 Proposals

PIN: 10045
Applicant Name: Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County
Project Title: Northern Santa Cruz County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

Funds Requested: \$ 25,000,000
Total Project Cost: \$ 93,605,392

Total Proposal Score:	91
------------------------------	-----------

Description: Through this proposal, seven partner agencies in Northern Santa Cruz County would implement fifteen projects for protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and maintaining and enhancing habitats.

Question: *Adopted IRWMP and Proof of Formal Adoption*

4

The proposal states that all implementing agencies have adopted the IRWMP. Separate resolutions of adoption are submitted for Santa Cruz County, Santa Cruz Sanitation District, Santa Cruz Resource Conservation District, Soquel Creek Water District, and Scotts Valley Water District. A resolution stating the Davenport Sanitation District adopted the IRWMP is not found, so a score of 5 is not given.

Question: *Description of Region*

4

The IRWMP region is wholly in Santa Cruz County. The Pajaro watershed is in the county but not in this IRWMP region and is participating in a separate IRWMP. The Watsonville Slough area is in this IRWMP and is also included in the Pajaro IRWMP. In the application, the applicant addresses the coordination with the Pajaro efforts by directing reviewer to an unrevised portion of the IRWMP. This information does not sufficiently support an improvement from the Step 1 score.

Question: *Objectives*

5

IRWMP objectives and how they were developed are described. Water related conflicts in the region are described in the Regional Description section.

Question: *Water Management Strategies and Integration*

5

The IRWMP defines "strategies" as potential projects that meet the IRWMP's objectives. The water management strategies are referenced; some are discussed as components of the 55 potential projects. Many of the projects address more than one of the strategies. Key linkages between projects and the IRWMP objectives they address are discussed. Benefits of integrating the strategies are discussed.

Question: *Priorities and Schedule*

4

Regional priorities are established to select projects to implement. The three project priorities are: 1) meet at least three IRWMP objectives, 2) be ready to construct, and 3) have adequate local matching funds. The 17 projects deemed high priority are the short-term and the other 38 projects are the long-term implementation priorities. The schedule for the 17 projects is included; one project is to monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the 17 projects in order to assess whether they meet their intended objectives. Another project is to refine and upgrade the existing IRWMP. It is not fully explained what decision making process will be used to adjust project or IRWMP priorities.

Question: *Implementation*

4

Implementation projects are described. The institutional structure for implementation is described. Technical feasibility of projects are assumed to be within relevant documents listed, but their applicability is not directly explained. In the application, the applicant addresses technical feasibility by directing reviewers to the Statewide Priority portion of the IRWMP. The provided information does not sufficiently support an improvement from the Step 1 score.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County

Question: Impacts and Regional Benefits

4

Although many of the implementation projects are to be locally implemented, they are linked in the IRWMP to regional improvements. Benefits to DAC's are described. A fuller discussion of negative impacts from implementation of the IRWMP is needed. In the application, the applicant addresses impacts by stating the Step 2 proposal contains a task for environmental compliance for all projects. The IRWMP is unrevised. This information does not sufficiently support an improvement from the Step 1 score.

Question: Technical Analysis and Plan Performance

4

The technical support for most of the implementation projects is in previous studies referenced under each project, but they are not directly discussed in the IRWMP. This section of the IRWMP references Section Q, where a list of studies is located. The list is organized by sub-basin. How existing data were technically reviewed is unclear. A technically related method for selection of projects is briefly described. The applicant addresses the review of technical data by referring the reviewer to a website. The website serves as a regionally accessible database of technical information for the purposes of IRWMP implementation. The information from the website is not incorporated into the technical analysis discussion of the IRWMP. This information does not sufficiently support an improvement from the Step 1 score.

Question: Data Management

4

Only a general mechanism for data management is presented. Dissemination of data is also generally described as a partnership with existing data managers. The purpose of Project 16 is to ensure integration of IRWMP monitoring with both SWAMP and GAMA. In the application, the applicant describes an online project management tool which is currently utilized and continues to be developed. It is not clear how this will be incorporated into IRWMP data management.

Question: Financing

5

Financing for IRWMP implementation is described in general terms as coming from matching funds from in-kind services, local agency/organization cash contribution, and a Federal 319 grant. O&M costs are discussed. Beneficiaries are described in general terms as the residents of the region and the state as a whole. Some specifics are provided, such as the benefit to Watsonville (a DAC).

Question: Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability

5

This criteria is adequately addressed. Proposed projects list the relevant local planning documents on which they are based. Santa Cruz County, who is an active participating agency in the IRWMP, makes many land-use decisions. Most of the IRWMP projects come directly from existing local or regional planning documents.

Question: Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination

4

Stakeholder involvement in creating the IRWMP focuses on known, active, local agencies and groups under the direction of the six participating agencies. Most of the structure for stakeholder involvement will be established during IRWMP implementation and will be fully developed with the implementation of Project 17. EJ concerns are briefly discussed. Obstacles to IRWMP implementation are mentioned. Affected State and federal agencies are listed and specifics of their involvement are described project by project.

Weighted IRWMP Total Score: 26

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County

Question: Work Plan

6

Better organization of this attachment and supporting data is needed to clarify the projects' adequacy, scope, and intent. Project descriptions are brief and require searching supporting information for explanations of the projects. Many projects are in preliminary stages. Tasks are not detailed. Milestones are not identified. Linkages among many of the projects are listed but not discussed. There is little discussion of current status, work completed, or permit requirements. Projects 3, 4, and 8 support future projects. Project 2 is a program which may disburse grant funds directly to the public. There is not enough detail to confirm project eligibility or certainty the project will be implemented. Projects 2, 4, 5, 13 and 14 are lacking work item detail or supporting data to determine adequate scope, feasibility, or readiness to proceed.

Question: Budget

2

The application contains a summary budget and budgets for each of the 17 individual projects. The individual project budgets lack detail and do not correlate to the work described in the project descriptions. The budgets do not agree with the work items shown in the work plan. It is not possible to determine if the costs are reasonable because of the lack of detail. There is no supporting documentation for the costs.

Question: Funding Match

5

The funding match is 73% of the total proposal costs.

Question: Schedule

2

The applicant provided an overall summary schedule and individual schedules for each project. Work items are more comprehensively discussed in the schedule, but that discussion does not coincide with work plan and budget. Most projects commence (PAEP, Admin, etc.) May-July 2007 with only limited details on readiness to proceed. The schedule is clearly not consistent and not reasonably achievable.

Question: Scientific and Technical Merit

9

The applicant identifies letters from stakeholder agencies and organizations which support the technical merit of various projects. The proposal lists supporting studies, but does not consistently direct the reviewer to specific portions of the study that supports the project's merit. There is not a detailed discussion of how a particular study or data support the feasibility of a project. A letter from the California Coastal Commission is included which identifies areas that should be addressed within the IRWMP. The applicant lists projects which are associated with those areas, but does not adequately explain how the projects address the issues in the letter. The presence or absence of project-specific data gaps is not discussed for each project. A data gap is identified for Project 2, but it is not referenced to a specific item in the work plan.

Question: Monitoring, Assessment and Performance Measures

5

Applicant did provide a comprehensive project performance measurement tools table for most projects that will allow a determination of whether the objectives will be met for each project. Project 12 referred to Project 13's output indicators and measurement tools and methods.

Question: Economic Analysis

9

Present value of costs is \$91.5 million and quantified benefits are about \$64 million. Most of the costs (\$48.8 million) are for a desalination plant. The estimated total supply is about 5,000 AF, including 2.5 MGD from desalination. The information provided in Attachment 10 is incomplete. The physical benefits of Projects 8, 9, and 10 are not well described. What is the expected water supply from desalination? When would production begin? How would it increase over time? Would it be used in wet years? Why are the alternative projects constructed in 2010? Are there management options that might be more cost-effective? A reference to Attachment 11 should be provided for projects 5, 7 and 16. More information about the timing, features and yield of Projects 3 and 6 would be useful.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County

Question: Other Expected Benefits

6

An average level of Other Expected Benefits is anticipated. Reduced pesticide application, response and repair costs, illness, flood damages, harbor dredging costs, and other savings, along with improved recreational values, are claimed. The claimed benefits are not very well documented, but are generally reasonable. Benefits that are not quantifiable, such as reduced public health risks associated with poor drinking water, are reasonable. More detail would help the reviewer understand the certainty of the benefits.

Question: Program Preferences

3

The proposal implements 5 of the 6 program preferences. The applicant responded to the Step 1 comment "project #11 provides safe drinking water, but it does not directly go to a DAC" by stating that several other projects provide water quality benefits to Watsonville, a DAC, in addition to this project. The discussion of two of the preferences does not demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the preference claims can be achieved, or document the breadth and magnitude to which these preferences will be implemented.

Question: Statewide Priorities

18

The applicant addressed 5 of 8 Statewide Priorities and emphasized implementation of TMDLs. The TMDL Statewide Priority is addressed with a moderate degree of certainty. Projects directly or indirectly support implementation of various TMDLs within the region. Discussion of the depth and magnitude to which projects will address this TMDLs could be more fully developed. Other Statewide Priorities are addressed with less detail, and the degree of certainty that the priority will be implemented is not thoroughly supported. For example, to address the Statewide Priority of "Implementing Recommendations of the Desalination Task Force," the applicant states that the recommendations were considered in planning Project 8, but does not discuss how Project 8 will implement these recommendations.

Total Proposal Score:	91
------------------------------	-----------